

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 21-CR-469-JFH

SHAWN ALEXANDER SIMPSON,

Defendant.

OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is a Motion to Reconsideration [sic] (“Motion”) filed by Defendant Shawn Alexander Simpson (“Defendant”). Dkt. No. 114. Defendant requests the Court reconsider an Order it issued April 3, 2024 [Dkt. No. 106] that denied a motion for discovery [Dkt. No. 103] filed by Defendant.

“[T]he Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not recognize that creature known all too well as the ‘motion to reconsider’ or ‘motion for reconsideration.’” *Warren v. Am. Bankers Ins. of Fla.*, 507 F.3d 1239, 1243 (10th Cir. 2007). While perhaps appropriate “where the court has misapprehended the facts, a party’s position, or the controlling law,” such a motion “is not appropriate to revisit issues already addressed or advance arguments that could have been raised in prior briefing.” *Servants of the Paraclete v. Does*, 204 F.3d 1005, 1012 (10th Cir. 2000). Defendant largely reiterates his previous arguments and the additional arguments he raises could have been raised in prior briefing.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant’s Motion [Dkt. No. 114] is DENIED.

Dated this 17th day of July 2024.



JOHN F. HEIL, III
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE